

**NOTE: These minutes do not constitute a verbatim transcription of the CPC meeting.**

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
April 7, 2005**

**APPROVED**

- Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Arthur Simons in the Committee of the Whole Room, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor of the Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, at 4:50 PM.
- Roll Call: Present at the meeting were Commissioners Cason, Christensen, Glaser, Glenn, Jeffrey, Simons, Wendler and Williams. Absent was Commissioner Smith (excused).
- Agenda: The Agenda was approved as submitted.
- Minutes: **ACTION:** Commissioner Glenn moved to approve the minutes of Regular Meeting of March 17, 2005.  
Commission Cason seconded the motion.  
Motion carried.
- PUBLIC HEARING--  
Request of Central Brush Park LLC to approve PD plans in the area of John R, Watson, Brush, and Edmund Place (Brush Park) for infill Housing:
- A public hearing was held on the request of Central Brush Park LLC to approve the plans for an existing PD (Planned Development District) in the area of John R, the alley north of Watson, Brush, and the alley south of Edmund Place in Brush Park in order to construct infill housing in a variety of housing types and styles.
- CPC staff member Gregory Moots reviewed the background information, surrounding zoning and land use, and proposed development.
- The development consists of the construction of approximately 145 units on approximately 6.3 acres. Central Brush Park, LLC was chosen by the Planning and Development Department as the developer of this area after the issuance of a Request for Proposal (RFP). The Historic District Commission has reviewed and approved the proposed site plan and design.
- The residential lofts at the southeast corner of Edmund Place and John R and the northwest and southwest corners of Edmund Place and Brush would have 25 units each (total 75 units) and would be 5 stories (with an additional possible mezzanine floor) in height. Unit sizes would range from 1,100 – 4,100 square feet. Parking would be on the first floor. Facades would be primarily brick, with a contrasting masonry base.
- Clustered rowhouses are proposed along Watson and Edmund Place, and would contain 2, 4, or 5 units, depending on the size of the available land. Exteriors would be brick with masonry highlights. There would be three-story units containing 2,160 square feet as well as two-story units containing 2,200 square feet. Parking would be in the rear of the first

floor of all the buildings; access to the garages would be from the alley. A total of 35 units would be in these style buildings.

The custom carriage house on the south side of Watson between Brush and John R would be a combination of a garage and loft building. The first floors of the buildings would contain a total of 16 single-car garages and would be tall enough to allow the use of vehicle lofts in the future to double the capacity. Second stories in each building would contain two lofts of 1,400 square feet each. Exteriors would be brick with masonry highlights. Entrances to the garages would be from the sides; each garage would have a separate door.

The live-work lofts proposed at the northwest and southwest corners of Watson and Brush and at the southwest corner of John R and Edmund Place would have one-story attached garages with live-work spaces on the first and second floors. The residential units would range in size from 1,300 – 2,400 square feet. The exact size of the buildings would depend on site size. Retail uses on the first floor are contemplated in the future, though there are no off-street parking spaces provided for retail at this time. Facades would be primarily brick with a contrasting masonry base. A total of 16 units are proposed in this style structure.

Two-story carriage houses are proposed along the alleys in the project. The houses would have garages on the first floor and a deck above the garage. The units would contain 1,300 square feet and two bedrooms. A total of 15 units are proposed in the four buildings of this style. Access would be from the alley. Exteriors would be brick with masonry highlights. The number of units in the structures varies depending on the lot configuration.

The Master Plan designation for this area is RM - Medium Density Residential, which is defined as having an overall density of 21 to 30 dwelling units per net residential acre. The project is consistent with this designation, having approximately 23 units/acre. The Modified Development Plan for Brush Park shows Medium Density Residential as the proposed land use for the subject area. The proposed uses, heights, parking requirements, and density meet the requirements of that designation. The developer has committed to meet the goal stated in the Development Plan that 20% of the units be affordable to persons of moderate income as defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The developers have attempted to present the proposed plans to the Brush Park Citizens' District Council on several occasions. At a recent meeting, the District Council claimed that there wasn't enough time to finish reviewing the plans because the CDC had to be out of the building where the meeting was being held by a certain time.

The Commission office received four letters in support of the development. Copies of these letters were included in the CPC table packets.

Commissioner Cason expressed support for the design but cited the need for including definitions on the key. What is a residential loft? What is a carriage house? What is a live-work loft? He noted that the terms appeared to be a departure from traditional definitions. What is the relationship of this design to the original loft design (New York)? He cited the need for more narrative.

Dwight Belyue, Manager, Central Brush Park, LLC, explained the difference. A live work loft is situated on a smaller footprint. These types of units provide flexibility in offering retail on the first floor and living space on the top two levels. Residential lofts provide for the possibility of retail on the first floor but all of the units on the second floor and above are residential. Mr. Belyue noted that the residential lofts have a “hard edge” style similar to older warehouse type units, e.g., concrete floors, exposed duct works, etc.

Commissioner Simons inquired as to the location of the entryways to the carriage houses. Would pedestrians have to walk through the alley to enter the carriage houses? Mr. Belyue noted that primary access is via the alley. The carriage houses could also be accessed via the main street. The alley will be repaved. Each unit has a garage.

Jim Marusich of the Planning & Development Department (P&DD) expressed support for the project. The project fits in well with the overall Development Plan for Brush Park. Numerous meetings and a public hearing had been held with the community. The City is now in the implementation phase of the Development Plan. An RFP was issued for the proposed project. The developer is qualified to do the project. The developments offer a variety of sizes of housing, and tax breaks. Brush Park is beginning to turn around.

Upon questioning, Mr. Belyue noted that the price of the units ranges from \$130,000 to \$500,000. The area has received a Neighborhood Enterprise Zone designation. The designation will assist in expanding the affordability of the units to buyers. A \$130,000-\$140,000 condominium unit should be affordable to a buyer with an annual income of \$35,000. Condo association fees are approximately \$120 per month.

Some Commissioners questioned whether a person earning \$35,000 per year would be able to afford a \$130,000 house. Mr. Belyue noted that affordability would depend on various factors such as interest rates at the time of purchase, the amount of the mortgage, the amount of the down payment, whether the buyer is a first-time buyer, etc.

Commissioner Simons read HUD’s definition for low-moderate income.

Commissioner Glenn felt it would be nice if Detroiters wanting to move into a new area of the City could move into Brush Park. He felt that the City should look at attracting that population too.

In response to Commissioner Jeffrey, Mr. Moots confirmed that the developer has committed to providing 20% of the units to persons of moderate income as defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Commissioner Jeffrey commended the developer on committing to the 20% provision.

The following persons spoke at the public hearing.

Timothy Colbeck, Commercial Development Manager for the University City Cultural Association, 4735 Cass, expressed support. Physical aspects of the project such as size, massing and design are appropriate for an historical area. The project offers a nice mix in size of units and cost. Greenspace is also being preserved.

Elaine Hearn, Brush Park Development Corporation, 2930 Woodward, expressed support for the project. The Corporation would like to serve as a liaison to provide infill housing in the area.

Gwendolyn Mingo, 269 Watson, Chairperson of the Brush Park Citizens District Council, expressed opposition. She asked that the project not be reviewed by the CPC prior to obtaining input from the CDC. The CDC has not reviewed the project. The developer did not present necessary documents to the CDC for its review prior to the CPC meeting. At the last CDC meeting, the developer did not have enough copies. Also there wasn't enough time to discuss the project.

Mr. Belyue explained that the CDC had asked him not to attend today's hearing until the CDC had reviewed the project. He told the CDC he could not comply with its request, but that he would attend its next meeting on April 12 to present the project. Mr. Moots noted that the CDC was concerned about it not receiving a color copy of the plan from the developer.

Mr. Moots noted that he would also be attending the CDC meeting. In response to Commissioner Williams, CPC staff noted that its report and recommendation to the Commission would contain the concerns raised at the April 12 CDC meeting.

Commissioner Jeffrey asked Ms. Mingo if she had any concerns based on tonight's presentation. Ms. Mingo expressed concern that the 20% being set aside for low to moderate income persons is not representative of low to moderate income. She felt that people who had been living in Brush Park prior to the redevelopment would not benefit from the project. They cannot afford the cost of the units. The proposed design for the housing units does not meet historical guidelines. The CDC proposed single-family units but multiple unit structures are being built. She did not want a five-story houses to be built on her street. The Board never approved the design for the carriage houses. She expressed opposition to entering the carriage houses via the alley. She questioned how the project relates to existing development. Current residents cannot "get a dime" for rehab unless they have something to do with the Brush Park Development Corporation. The houses of the current residents of Brush Park are falling apart. The Corporation is providing landscaping for the new development, but other sections do not have landscaping.

In response to Commissioner Cason, Ms. Mingo stated that low-income residents cannot afford a \$140,000 house. Instead, she suggested pricing at \$50,000-\$70,000 for a 2-3 bedroom home. That is what was in place prior to the displacement of Brush Park residents. She expressed concern regarding the way the residents of Brush Park have been treated.

Ms. Mingo expressed concern that patrons to the 2006 Superbowl would be parking in Brush Park and the Brewster Douglas areas. Ms. Bruhn noted plans for shuttled parking services. She also cited the possibility of Brush Park applying for and receiving designation as a residential parking permit district. CPC staff did note problems with the City enforcing parking ordinances. CPC staff would get back with Ms. Mingo regarding her concerns.

Ms. Mingo inquired as to the time line for development of the project. Mr. Belyue noted that Phase I should be completed in late fall. Ms. Mingo expressed concern that Phase I of another development was to begin two years ago but has not yet begun.

Commissioner Jeffrey noted longstanding concern of Brush Park homeowners. He inquired as to whether there is money available to assist in the rehabilitation of their property. Ms. Hearn noted that to date, 15 residents have received grants for facade improvements. Ms. Hearn noted that the Corp. is getting homeowners to apply for the program. A homeowner can receive up to a \$100,000 grant for facade improvements, but he/she must provide a \$60,000 match for rehab for the interior. Ms. Mingo felt that the grants had not been given out fairly. She complained that she and other residents have not received a grant. Only the Development Corporation's people obtain the grants. Ms. Hearn countered that the City will not consider Ms. Mingo's request for a grant because she has erected an illegal fence around her property. The others cited by Ms. Mingo have not applied for a grant.

Mr. Moots clarified that the Development Plan allows for the construction of a five-story house. Ms. Mingo emphasized that the CDC did not approve the inclusion of five-story housing in the Development Plan. She contended that the process for redevelopment in Brush Park represented the worst case of gentrification.

Betty Clark, 430 E. Warren, indicated opposition but gave her time to Ms. Mingo. Ms. Mingo noted that Ms. Clark, a senior citizen with a degenerative bone disease, was displaced from Brush Park without relocation benefits. Ms. Clark was hoping that single-family homes affordable to low-moderate income persons could be built in Brush Park.

Rev. Mary Gause, 3402 Brush, expressed opposition. Rev. Gause noted that she would not sell her property. She noted that she has been without water since 1989. A water main break at that time resulted in basement flooding and damage to her building. Rev. Gause believed that the City was aware that she doesn't have water. Mr. Moots and the Planning & Development Department noted that Rev. Gause's property is exempt from the acquisition list.

The Commission requested CPC staff to check with the Department of Water and Sewerage (DW&S) regarding the problem. Commissioner Glaser requested a full report from DW&S as to what has happened since 1989.

Commissioner Jeffrey noted that with all the private development taking place, some effort should be made by the City to create a mechanism to assist the people who have stayed in Brush Park to allow them to benefit from this "new found excitement" in the Brush Park area. He suggested that perhaps the funds could be leveraged with private funding. The residents do not want to be pushed out. Commissioner Williams suggested providing grants or low interest loans.

Mona Ross, 373 Erskine, a former CDC member expressed support for the proposed project and most of the development in Brush Park. She recommended that the community needs to get together, stop arguing and move forward. She cited the need to help the seniors in the area. No institution is going to loan \$60,000 to a person such as Rev. Gause in order to

obtain a \$100,000 grant for facade improvements. Seniors should have the ability to obtain these grants without having to put up money. The community just wants to be treated fairly.

Commissioner Williams alluded to other programs specifically designed to assist someone like Mrs. Gause. CPC staff was directed to compile a list of those programs and distribute it to individuals in the area.

**ACTION: Commissioner Glenn moved that the CPC schedule a Special Meeting to work to resolve Ms. Gause's problems.  
Commissioner Glaser seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Cason felt that the DW&S Department should be called on the issue of water being shut off since 1989. The Commission does not need to hold a special meeting. CPC staff should find out the facts around the problem.

Ms. Bruhn agreed. She suggested that CPC staff would obtain the history and facts regarding the water shut-off, and information about rehabilitation programs.

Commissioner Williams again cited the availability of other financial programs that would allow residents to remain in Brush Park.

Upon questioning, Ms. Bruhn noted that in order to qualify for an NEZ certificate, a certain level of rehabilitation has to be completed. Ms. Ross noted that the community is not familiar with the NEZ guidelines.

Commissioner Glaser felt that an affordable housing toolbox should be created for Brush Park. Many people cannot afford a \$130,000 home. The City needs to determine how to put these people into an affordable house.

Commissioner Cason summarized the history of the creation of a development plan for Brush Park and discussions with Mamie Moon.

Commissioner Williams commented that the population with income between public housing and moderate income does not get served.

Kathy Janiczek, 82 Alfred St., expressed support but raised concern regarding parking. She inquired as to the total number of units and parking spaces. Mr. Moots responded that approximately 145 units are proposed. A total of 1 ¼ parking spaces are proposed for the multi-units and 1 1/2 parking spaces for the rowhouses. The project meets the parking requirements of the Development Plan. On-street parking is also provided on east and west streets. Ms. Janiczek expressed concern about shortages created as a result of intruding parking in the Brush Park neighborhood for the stadia. The community needs to be designated as a residential parking permit district. CPC staff was requested to talk to Ms. Janiczek on initiating the process. Mr. Moots noted that the developer is also interested in pursuing residential parking permits. The CPC office has information on the process and petitions and would assist the community in its pursuit. Ms. Janiczek requested additional information on the NEZ process. Ms. Janiczek noted numerous problems and interruptions

in service during the construction phase of other developments in Brush Park. Crosswinds decided to close the alley near Alfred St. Water was cut off for two months. The post office would not deliver mail for six months. The telephone company disconnected phone lines. Residing in the midst of the development process is very challenging. It is even more difficult for senior citizens to live under such conditions.

Commissioner Cason expressed concern regarding the lack of dimensions on the site plan. Mr. Moots noted that the developer is not required to provide interior dimensions. CPC staff looks at the pre-construction drawings and the appearance of the buildings rather than interior dimensions.

Commissioner Simons inquired as to accommodations for the pickup of garbage for the carriage houses. Mr. Belyue responded that garbage trucks will either come inside the area or an area will be sectioned off for garbage collection.

Commissioner Williams expressed concern regarding quality of life issues for residents during construction phases.

The husband of Ms. Janiczek noted specifics of the facade improvement program including signing of an easement agreement. His family received a \$100,000 facade improvement grant from the Brush Park Development Corporation conditioned upon the expenditure of \$60,000 on interior improvements over a five-year period.

Joann Wilburn, 236 Adelaide, expressed support. Ms. Wilburn indicated that she received a facade improvement grant. Ms. Wilburn inquired as to parking. She noted many problems in the community as a result of stadia tailgating and parking on vacant lots in Brush Park. The City needs to teach or redirect people into downtown parking structures.

Commissioner Williams noted parking problems that might occur as a result of the All Star Baseball game this summer. Ms. Bruhn noted that the City is supposed to be enforcing laws prohibiting parking on vacant lots.

The matter was taken under advisement.

PUBLIC  
HRG.—  
Amendment  
to the  
Master Plan  
for East  
Riverside  
Subsector  
to allow  
for residen-  
tial  
development:

A public hearing was held on the request of the Planning & Development Department (P&DD) to amend the Generalized Proposed Land Use Map for the East Riverside Subsector to show an RL (Low-Density Residential) designation where RH (High-Density Residential), MP (Major Park), LT IND (Light Industrial) and SRC (Special Residential-Commercial) designations exist for the area generally bounded by Freud, Lycaste, the Detroit River, and St. Jean. The amendment is being proposed to allow for residential development of condominium townhouses, single family detached homes, and a 23-story condominium tower with attached parking garage.

CPC staff member Kathryn Underwood reviewed the background information and staff's preliminary analysis.

The vacant subject property is the former Laro Coal site and has not been in productive use for years. Because of its former industrial use, environmental remediation is necessary to allow for residential use. The State of Michigan has performed some remediation at the site. Additional remediation will be necessary and will be handled by the developer. The site is currently owned by the City of Detroit, except for three contiguous parcels on St. Jean near the southern end of the site, those being Precision Marine, Hackett Brass and Thompson Properties. Land use to the north and east of the site is industrial. Land use to the west is presently a marina that includes plans for residential development. The Jefferson Village project is northwest of the site. P&DD intends to transition riverfront land in this area from industrial uses to residential uses.

Notice of and request for comments on the proposed Master Plan amendment was sent to adjacent municipalities, Wayne County and other entities as required by the Municipal Planning Act. The Water and Sewerage Department sent a letter stating that they would determine the impact of the proposed development on their existing facilities after site plans and detailed drawings have been submitted to the department. No other comments were received.

Bruce Evans of the P&DD noted that Precision Marine, Hackett Brass and Thompson Properties are designated SRC in the current Master Plan. They are not designated as industrial uses. P&DD supports amending the Master Plan to allow residential land uses to come in. The area is appropriate for low residential uses. Within the next 10-20 years, the area will become more residential, with a park space along the River.

Ms. Underwood noted that the CPC office received two telephone inquiries as a result of the public hearing notice. One inquiry was for clarification of the Future General Land Use Map and the other was regarding the impact of the proposed low-density designation on existing industry.

Ms. Underwood noted that the current zoning of the subject property is M4 (Intensive Industrial District). The developer has petitioned for a rezoning to PD (Planned Development District). A public hearing on the proposed rezoning was held by the CPC on February 3, 2005. Issues raised at the public hearing included ownership of certain parcels included in the rezoning request; impact of a proposed Neighborhood Enterprise Zone designation; whether or not the proposed development is the best use of the land, particularly because of the proximity to industrial uses; problems with Petro-Chemical Processing, located north of the subject area; impact on existing industrial uses; and public access to the river. CPC staff contacted the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, the Fire Department, the Department of Environmental Affairs and the Department of Health and Wellness Promotion with regard to the environmental and health and safety matters.

Bruce King of the Department of Environmental Affairs responded to concerns about Petro-Chemical. He explained the industry's processing operations including the taking in of 53,582,748 lbs. of hazardous materials annually and releasing 2,512 lbs. of solvents through air emission controls. The facility has a thermal oxidizing unit and scrubber. Since 1999, Petro-Chemical has had three fires. Current reports measuring the amount of toxins released indicate fugitive agents were not released.



John Lamb of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) believed that Petro-Chemical did not pose a risk to the surrounding area. Rates of emission are low--approximately 10 lbs./day. Since 2002-2004, the industry has received 70 violations, none of which were for actual spills. Most of the violations were paperwork related. In June 2003, complaints were received about odors. Since 2003, Petro-Chemical installed additional controls. The MDEQ performs quarterly inspections. As to concerns of how the surrounding area would be impacted in case of a dangerous release of toxins, Mr. Lamb cited emergency response guidelines. The minimum distance for isolation is 160 feet. The closest residence is 180 feet away. If a spill occurred on the inside of the property, evacuation might not occur. If the event of a major fire, the area up to 1000 feet would be evacuated.

Commissioner Glenn expressed concern about the impact of the industry on children and playground in the area. Mr. Lamb noted that Petro-Chemical does not process metals. It emits only 10 lbs. of compounds a day. The organic compounds evaporate.

Commissioner Glenn inquired as to whether debris is being hauled away from the site. Mr. Lamb responded negatively. The hazardous waste products are turned into a solvent. He explained the industry's use of stacks, scrubbers and a thermoxidizer.

Upon questioning, Mr. Lamb noted that Petro-Chemical has not violated air quality permits.

Upon questioning, Mr. King noted that there have been three fires since 1999, the last one being in 2004. An evacuation was not necessary. The Fire Department managed the fire. If Petro-Chemical should burn, the fire could affect a four to five mile area. But, normal operating procedures have to be taken into consideration. The developer is putting in berms and trees to help block out Petro-Chemical. The buffers would help create a visual barrier and a filtering system.

The following persons spoke at the public hearing.

Steven Hume, owner/operator of Detroit Boat Works, 95 St. Jean, expressed opposition. He submitted a letter which questioned whether another generation of Detroit citizens should be cut off from the city's most valuable and beautiful resource. The change to the Master Plan to allow the rezoning to PD for residential would be a grave mistake that may take the City generations to rectify. Commercial development, not residential, is what is needed to allow average Detroit residents to enjoy the River. Winter boat storage, engine and hull repair services, restaurants, fishing and tourist attractions are the kinds of businesses that will allow the waterfront to become part of the lives of hundreds of citizens of Detroit, not just a select few who can afford a million dollar income. The Morgan Estates proposal will result in the loss of the public boat launching ramp at the foot of St. Jean which is used by hundreds of small boat owners and their families. The proposed housing is in proximity to one of the largest processors of organic liquid hazardous waste in the U.S., Petro-Chemical Processing Group. Even though this is a very clean, professional operation, the nature of the business poses an occasional high risk of air contamination and explosion. Evacuation of high density housing residents could be very troublesome given the present layout. It is in close proximity to an extremely large gas-fired electrical generation plant and switching stations

which produce a deafening noise when they blow off a head of steam. Its placement is directly in the final approach to the main runway at Detroit City Airport. This is especially troubling for the proposed high-rise building which is Phase Three of the Morgan Estates proposal. Mr. Hume noted that the CPC should be commended for its efforts to redevelop the riverfront for use by the citizens of Detroit. Everyone shares a vision of the City in which everyone will have ample opportunity to enjoy the beauty of our water resources. The Morgan Estates proposal currently will do just the opposite. Not only will it block Detroiters' access to the waterfront, it will work counter to job creation and the long-term economic health of Detroit. The vision for the property should include many water-related businesses, including boat storage, rentals, and repairs, restaurants, outdoor sports activities and water-related museums. These type of activities will create jobs and enhance the quality of life in the larger community.

Lucas Wright, Hackett Brass, 45 St. Jean, expressed opposition. "Putting residential around a business will put that business out of business." Homeowners will say the industries are "ugly". Eventually those industries will be forced out of business. He cited the negative impact of an existing truck route on Freud on residential development. He questioned the amount of berm a developer could create to buffer industrial uses from residential. He cited risks to residents, noting fires that have occurred at Petro-Chemical every two years.

Libby Pachota of Jefferson East Business Association emphasized that the City needs both residents and businesses. She questioned why the existing businesses are not included in the proposed rezoning amendment. Ms. Bruhn noted that the Master Plan represents the City's long-term vision of more residential on the waterfront. Ideally, the City would want the zoning to match. However, the City is sensitive to the fact that there are three industries in that location who are not happy about the zoning. The PD zone could negatively impact those businesses' ability to sell their property and continue the same use. The approach being taken is incremental.

Ms. Pachota inquired as to the status of the public boat launch. Ms. Underwood responded that the public boat launch is part of the Harbor Hill development and is not affected by the amendment or rezoning. The boat launch is to remain public. Also, greenspace will be improved.

Ms. Pachota requested the rationale for defining the proposed 23-story apartment complex as a residential low-density use. Mr. Evans noted when contemplating the proposed Master Plan designation, P&DD considered a large, generalized area when counting the number of residential units for the area. The area count is 7.5 dwelling units per acre. Low-density residential is up to 12 dwelling units per acre.

Ms. Pachota suggested obtaining a copy of the MEQD's report. She expressed concern regarding the impact of truck traffic from TDS trucking company located at Phillip and Freud. She cited the need to address air quality in the area. Ms. Pachota noted that from her home in Grosse Pointe Park, she has been able to smell odors from this area. Ms. Pachota requested to meet with the representatives of the Department of Environmental Affairs and the developer regarding adequate buffering of the residential from the surrounding and adjacent land uses and compliance issues for Petro-Chemical and others.

Bruce Hubbard, 14626 Harbor, expressed opposition. He complained that no one has been able to tell him whether or not an RFP was issued for the Morgan Estates development. He said Phase I of the development is a "joke." Phase III of the development is a possibility. He inquired as to the amount of money the developer is paying for the property. The public should be allowed to be on that site. Mr. Hubbard expressed concern as to what the developers have done to Harbor Hill. The developers are "stealing" the City.

Commissioner Jeffrey noted that St. Jean is the only exit out of this area. He raised concern about the possible evacuation of residents in the event of a serious fire at Petro-Chemical.

Mr. King noted guidelines of the Office of Homeland Security when considering moving out persons or keeping them in place based on the situation. A greater risk might occur when moving through an area. Recommendations might include staying indoors, turning on air conditioning, etc.

Ms. Underwood noted that the proposed emergency exit is off of Lycaste. The Fire Department has been asked about emergency response situations.

Commissioner Jeffrey inquired as to whether the developer could obtain rezoning permits through the BZA if the CPC approved the amendment to the Master Plan. Mr. Evans responded that with or without the Master Plan change, the developer could still go to the BZA. The current Master Plan for that area is not industrial. The amendment will not influence what happens to the property. Ms. Underwood noted that the PD zone has to be consistent with the Master Plan.

Ms. Underwood agreed with the representative of Hackett Brass in that industrial uses are abrasive to residential uses. When a City makes a decision to change a land use from industrial to residential, every effort needs to be made to work with the businesses in the area to preserve the tax base and the jobs. To the best of its ability, the City should work with those businesses to make sure they can either stay or else be relocated to an acceptable place so that the City doesn't lose those jobs, tax base or the assets they represent. Ms. Underwood noted the challenges of constructing \$1 million homes immediately adjacent to industrial. The City needs to recognize a way to make it work and not choose industrial or residential over the other.

Commissioner Christensen noted that Detroit is an industrial city. All over the City there is residential in industrial areas. This mix exists throughout the City. He expressed concern about driving out industrial uses.

Mr. Wright noted that Precision Marine is also opposed to the change. He noted that one does not see \$.5 million houses adjacent to industrial uses.

Mr. Hume noted that the location of his boat slips at the end of the canal. Mr. Evans noted that the Master Plan change does not affect the use of those boat slips.

Suzanne Bishop, 174 Lenox, noted that waterfront is an asset to the neighborhood. Public access should be provided wherever possible along the riverfront. Ms. Underwood

responded that the developer has agreed to provide public access. Mr. Nowak of Morgan Estates pointed out the areas of the waterfront designated for public access.

Ms. Bishop cited the need for assurance that promises will be kept. She noted the status of Ingel Park which was given to the developers of Harbor Hill. Ms. Bishop expressed concern regarding the smells and noise generated from industry in the area.

Bob Dabrowski, Thompson Properties, expressed opposition, sharing in the concern already expressed by the adjacent businesses. He questioned the impact of the change on Thompson Properties. Does Thompson Properties become a non-conforming use should its property be sold? Ms. Bruhn noted that the property can remain as industrial. Another industrial use could go in should Thompson Properties be sold.

The matter was taken under advisement.

2005-2006  
CDBG:

Further discussion was held on CPC staff's preliminary recommendations on the 2005-2006 Community Development Block Grant program.

CPC staff member Christopher Gulock noted that CPC staff examined 49 proposals from 41 groups, as well as City-departmental projects, and Section 108 activities for 2005-6 CDBG line item funding. The entitlement amount for CDBG is \$43,322,807. P&DD has not yet released anticipated program and other income amounts, so the overall CDBG funding for 2005-06 is not expected to be known until April 12, 2005 when the Mayor delivers his proposed budget to City Council. Final CPC action is scheduled for April 14, 2005.

Commissioner Simons requested clarification on CPC staff's comments on the demolition program and recommendation of \$8.6 million. Mr. Gulock noted that 6,800 structures are in the system for demolition. A total of 1,100 buildings are proposed to be demolished this year. The cost for demolition is \$7,500 per building. CPC staff did not know how many structures were demolished last year.

Commissioner Jeffrey questioned whether the Planning and Development Department (P&DD) plans to recoup the cost of demolition from the property owners.

Upon questioning, Ms. Alcock noted that funding for the Senior Emergency Home Repair has been increased.

Discussion ensued on the need to redesign the home repair program.

Commissioner Jeffrey questioned whether economic development programs are separate from public service activities.

CPC explained the charts included in the CPC packets. These included recommendations for community groups by cluster.

Commissioner Jeffrey cited the need for a pie chart showing a breakout of recommendations by activity.

Commissioner Glaser inquired as to whether a structure is always torn down once a permit is pulled. Mr. Gulock responded affirmatively, but noted timing problems.

Commissioner Glaser requested a breakdown of the recommendations for the west side vs. east side, and by cluster.

As to the Neighborhood Opportunity Fund, Commissioner Jeffrey noted that CPC staff might have alternative suggestions than what was recommended by the Citizen Review Committee. For instance, CPC staff might have additional information on some of the organizations.

Commissioner Jeffrey inquired as to the reason for requiring a match for rehabilitation activities in Brush Park.

2005-2006  
NOF:

Further consideration was given to the Citizen Review Committee's recommendations on the 2005-06 Neighborhood Opportunity Fund (NOF) program.

CPC staff member Deborah Ferris noted that CPC staff verified that the Northern Area Association had submitted all of the required documentation to be considered for funding for home repair. CRC is now recommending funding 155 groups for a total of \$10,503,750.

CPC staff suggested looking at Mack Alive again.

Ms. Ferris noted that a breakout would be prepared for CPC showing recommendations by activity.

Commissioner Simons requested that proposal numbers be included on the chart.

Commissioner Simons inquired as to whether more groups were deemed ineligible this year compared to last year. Ms. Ferris responded that approximately the same number was deemed ineligible. She noted changes in City Council's criteria for 2005-06.

Commissioner Jeffrey expressed concern regarding CRC's recommendation to not fund Dominican Literacy because it did not meet the CPC's priorities. He noted the organization's excellent program. Although the program is not specifically geared to youth or seniors, it does reach out to teenaged youth. Ms. Ferris noted that if a program didn't focus on seniors or youth, the CRC did not recommend funding.

Commissioner Jeffrey cited the need to reconsider the CRC's recommendations on those organizations identified as not meeting the Commission's priorities, particularly those that provide education to youth.

Commissioner Glaser questioned whether Dominican Literacy is separate from Dominican High School. Ms. Ferris noted that it is an in-depth program separate from the school.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.